

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AMARDEEP GARMENTS
INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CATHAY BANK,

Defendant.

CV 11-2849 PA (RZx)

JUDGMENT

On March 28, 2013, the Court found that defendant Cathay Bank (“Defendant”) had no duty to explain more clearly the disclosure that it would not guarantee payment to plaintiffs Amardeep Garments Industries PVT. LTD., AMI Apparels PVT. LTD., Binita Fashion Industries PVT. LTD., Destination Apparels PVT. LTD., and Pretty Dressers LTD. (collectively “Plaintiffs”). The parties have agreed that was the sole issue left for determination in this action pursuant to the June 19, 2012 Order,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant shall have judgment in its favor against Plaintiffs.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Plaintiffs’ action is dismissed with prejudice.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Plaintiffs take
2 nothing and that Defendant shall have its costs of suit.

3
4 DATED: April 10, 2013



Percy Anderson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE